



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,855	11/13/2003	Hiroyuki Sugimoto	Q77877	4878

23373 7590 03/15/2006

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

ASINOVSKY, OLGA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1711

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/705,855

Applicant(s)

SUGIMOTO, HIROYUKI

Examiner

Olga Asinovsky

Art Unit

1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/13/2003</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Sugimoto et al U.S. Patent 6,316,090.

Sugimoto discloses a thermoplastic elastomer composition comprising a polyolefin resin and a rubbery polymer, and an ethylene-alpha-olefin copolymer rubber. The rubbery polymer can be a hydrogenated diene polymer rubber or a hydrogenated butadiene-styrene copolymer rubber, col. 3, lines 4-18 and 38-43, for the present claims 2. The MFR for the rubbery polymer is preferably at least 10 g/10 min, col. 4, lines 11-12. The MFR for the polyolefin resin is in the range of 20 to 300 g/10 min, col. 2, lines 64-66. Therefore, upon melt mixing the ingredients the resulting thermoplastic elastomer composition will inherently have a melt flow rate of not less than 10 g/10 min, for the present claim 1. The ethylene-alpha-olefin copolymer rubber is preferably crosslinked, col. 5, line 18-19. Therefore, depending on the crosslinking effect, an hardness of the ethylene-alpha-olefin is readable in the present claim 2 (iii). The formulation of the

Art Unit: 1711

thermoplastic elastomer composition is readable in the present claims. The resulting thermoplastic elastomer composition can be produced into a pellet form, thereafter the granule was cooled and then pulverized in the powder form giving 500 micron, col. 7, lines 20-39 and col. 13, lines 61-65. The process for producing a powder thermoplastic elastomer in Sugimoto invention is readable in the present claim 5. Sugimoto does not disclose a particle size of the powder in the range of 200 to 350 microns and a fine particle diameter of not more than 150 microns contained in the powder in the amount of not more than 25 wt.% in the present claim 1 or 10 microns in the present claim 4. However, it is reasonable to presume that the claimed properties would be easily obtained because Sugimoto discloses the same ingredients and the same process by freezing pulverization for obtaining the powder of the resulting thermoplastic elastomer composition. It is a burden on the applicants to provide the difference in order to overcome this rejection under In re Fitzgerald 205 USPQ 594.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugimoto et al U.S. Patent 6,316,090 in view of JP07096532.

4. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify powder polymer to a particle size of 200 and 350 microns and a fine particle of 150 microns in Sugimoto invention as suggested by JP'532 since both inventions disclose the analogous art under the same process for freezing pulverization of the resulting polymer into a powder form.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art has been considered. The closest invention is JP 07096532 that has been discussed above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olga Asinovsky whose telephone number is 571-272-1066. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 1711

O.A.

March 10, 2006

Olga Asinovsky
Examiner
Art Unit 1711



James J. Seidleck
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700